IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 30TH MAY 2007 / 9TH JYAISHTA 1929

WP(C).No. 14543 of 2007(F)

PETITIONER:

SIBI THOMAS, S/O. THOMAS,
MATHAMAKKAL HOUSE, KACHERIKADAVU P.O.,
KILIYANTHARA.

BY ADV. SRI.A.K.ABDUL AZEEZ

RESPONDENTS:

THE SECRETARY, RTA, KANNUR.

BY G.P. SHRI.I.V.PRAMOD.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 30/05/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

S.SIRI JAGAN, J.

==========

W.P.(C).No.14543 of 2007

==========

Dated this the 30th day of May, 2007

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner seeks disposal of Ext.P1 application stated to have been filed by him for revision of timings of his permit. I am not inclined to consider the request of the petitioner for several reasons. Firstly, neither in the writ petition nor in Ext.P1 petition, has the petitioner stated as to when the petitioner's timings were settled originally. The learned Government Pleader submits that no application for revision of timings of the petitioner has been received by the respondent. He also submits that originally timings of the petitioner were settled on 18.5.2006. The petitioner has also not stated in Ext.P1 or in the writ petition as to which permits have been issued subsequent to 18.5.2006 which would enable him to seek for revision of his timings. What the

petitioner would submit is that there is clash of timings. If there would be clash of timings in respect of subsequent permits, it was for the petitioner to object to the settlement of the timings of the subsequent operators and to take up in appeal, if the decision is against him. In view of the above circumstances, I am not inclined to entertain this writ petition and accordingly the same is dismissed.

Sd/-

sdk+ S.SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE

///True copy///

P.A. to Judge.